

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

ISRAEL MALDONADO RAMIREZ,

Plaintiff,

v.

KHALE, et al.,

Defendant.

1:22-cv-01653-ADA-HBK (PC)

ORDER DENYING MOTIONS FOR
MISCELLANEOUS RELIEF

(Doc. Nos. 14, 15)

Pending before the Court are two pro se motions filed by Plaintiff on March 9, 2023. (Doc. Nos. 14, 15). The motions fail to comport with the rules of procedure. The Court previously advised Plaintiff that all motions must “state with particularity the grounds for seeking the order; and state the relief sought.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 7(b)(1)(B), (C). (*See* Doc. No. 11). The Court cannot discern for what purpose Plaintiff submitted the motions.¹

According, it is **ORDERED**:

Plaintiff’s motions (Doc. Nos. 14, 15) are DENIED.

Dated: April 17, 2023


HELENA M. BARCH-KUCHTA
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

¹ Plaintiff intersperse professions of “love” within his vague requests for pens and paper.